UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,582	07/13/2001	Robert Sesek	10008030-1	4269

7590 05/04/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
SINGH, SATWANT K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/905,582	SESEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satwant K. Singh	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 July 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4-7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Melo et al. (US 6,431,772).

3. Regarding Claim 1, Melo et al disclose a computer-implemented printing system comprising: a set of printers configured to print user-selected print jobs (printers 210, 220 and 260); a communications link (public data communication network 250); and a processor linked via the communications link to the set of printers (computer 200), the processor having a user interface configured to accommodate user-selection of a sub-set of printers (button with a pointer device in a graphical user interface), the processor further configured to communicate plural print jobs to the sub-set of printers upon a single command (printer driver may transmit a print job one or more of the local printers 210 and 220, and a print job to the remote printer 260 in response to a single print request at an application) (col. 2, lines 25-67, col. 3, lines 1-6).

4. Regarding Claim 4, Melo et al disclose a system, wherein the communications link is the Internet (public data communication network 250, such as the Internet) (col. 2, lines 25-36).

5. Regarding Claim 5, Melo et al disclose a system, wherein at least one of the printers in the sub-set of printers is in a remote location from the processor (remote printer 260) (col. 2, lines 25-36).

6. Regarding Claim 6, Melo et al disclose a system, wherein the sub-set of printers is a single printer (either of local printers 210 or 220, or the remote printer 260) (col. 2, lines 51-54).

7. Regarding Claim 7, Melo et al disclose a computer-implemented printing system for printing to multiple print jobs via a single print command (in response to a single print request at an application), comprising: plural printers (printers 210, 220 and 260), each printer configured to print user-selected print jobs (button with a pointer device in a graphical user interface); a communications link (public data communication network 250); and a computer linked to the printers via the communications link (computer 200), the computer having a user interface configured to accommodate user selection of a plurality of print jobs (button with a pointer device in a graphical user interface), wherein the computer is further configured to communicate the plurality of print jobs to the respective printers without the user separately ordering each individual print job (printer driver may transmit a print job one or more of the local printers 210 and 220, and a print job to the remote printer 260 in response to a single print request at an application) (col. 2, lines 25-67, col. 3, lines 1-6).

8. Regarding Claim 10, Melo et al disclose a system, wherein plural print jobs are sent to a single printer (either of local printers 210 or 220, or the remote printer 260) (col. 2, lines 51-54).

9. Regarding Claim 11, Melo et al disclose a system, wherein the user interface includes a user-selectable submit icon (button with a pointer device in a graphical user interface) which sends the plurality of print jobs to the printers in a single command (printer driver may transmit a print job one or more of the local printers 210 and 220, and a print job to the remote printer 260 in response to a single print request at an application) (col. 2, lines 25-67, col. 3, lines 1-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12-14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melo et al. in view of Minari (US 6,809,831).

12. Regarding Claim 2, Melo et al fail to teach a system, wherein the user interface is configured to allow a user to select attributes for each print job.

Minari teaches a system, wherein the user interface is configured to allow a user to select attributes for each print job (Fig. 5, S502) (col. 4, lines 15-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Melo with the teaching of Minari to allow a user to select the characteristics for each print job.

13. Regarding Claim 3, Melo et al fail to teach a system, wherein the processor is further configured to store the plural print jobs as a distribution list for subsequent use.

Minari teaches a system, wherein the processor is further configured to store the plural print jobs as a distribution list for subsequent use (Fig. 4) (Memory 405 is equipped with a print job accumulator 407 that stores the print job object) (col. 4. lines 10-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Melo with the teaching of Minari to store the print jobs for printing later.

14. Claim 8 is rejected for the same reason as claim 2.

15. Claims 9, 14, and 20 are rejected for the same reason a claim 3.

16. Regarding Claim 12, Melo fails to teach a system, wherein the user interface includes a pull-down menu for user-selection of each print job.

Minari teaches a system, wherein the user interface includes a pull-down menu for user-selection of each print job (Fig. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Melo with the teaching of Minari to allow a user to choose attributes of a print job using a pull-down menu.

17. Regarding Claim 13, Melo et al teach a computer-implemented method of printing to multiple print jobs from a single computer in a single action, the method comprising: receiving user input defining plural print jobs; receiving a print directive to print the print jobs on respective network devices, wherein at least one of the network devices is a printer.

Melo et al fail to teach a computer-implemented method, the method comprising: each print job having print job attributes; and directing identified network devices to print respective print jobs according to the corresponding identified attributes.

Minari teaches a teach a computer-implemented method, the method comprising: each print job having print job attributes (Fig. 3) (user can set the print job attribute of the print job object on this set screen) (col. 3, lines 35-39); and directing identified network devices to print respective print jobs according to the corresponding identified attributes (print job executer 403 processes the print data referring to the print job attributes stored in the print job attribute section 502) (col. 4, lines 28-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Melo with the teaching of Minari to allow a user to print respective print jobs according to its characteristics.

18. Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as claim 13.

19. Claims 15-18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melo et al. and Minari as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Olson et al. (US 2002/0016921).

20. Regarding Claim 15, Melo et al and Minari fail to teach a method, where user input is selection of a print distribution list.

Olsen et al teach a method, where user input is selection of a print distribution list (pre-defined lists can be chosen from) (page 15, paragraphs [0349] and [0350]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Melo and Minari with the teaching of Olsen to allow a user to select a stored print distribution list for printing out print jobs.

21. Regarding Claim 16, Melo et al and Minari fail to teach a method, further comprising reaccessing the stored print distribution list and printing an electronic document according to the plural print jobs on the stored print distribution list.

Olsen et al teach a method, further comprising reaccessing the stored print distribution list and printing an electronic document according to the plural print jobs on the stored print distribution list (pre-defined lists can be chosen from) (page 15, paragraphs [0349] and [0350]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Melo and Minari with the teaching of Olsen to allow a user to select a stored print distribution list for printing out print jobs.

22. Regarding Claim 17, Melo et al and Minari fail to teach a method, further comprising reaccessing the print distribution list, modifying at least one print job on the print distribution list and printing an electronic document according to the plural print jobs on the modified print distribution list.

Olsen et al teach a method, further comprising reaccessing the print distribution list, modifying at least one print job on the print distribution list and printing an electronic document according to the plural print jobs on the modified print distribution list (AddJobData) (page 26, paragraph [0419].

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Melo and Minari with the teaching of Olsen to allow a user to update a print job stored in a print distribution list.

23. Regarding Claim 18, Melo et al teach a method, wherein the network devices also includes a computer (computer 200).

24. Claim 21 is rejected for the same reason is rejected for the same reason as claim 17.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Leiman et al. (US 6,469,796) discloses printing using a print server having a graphical user interface.

Leong et al. (US 6,687,018) discloses a system and method for distributing print jobs.

Yamagishi (US 6,819,444) discloses an image processing system and its control method for broadcast printing.

Gecht et al. (US 6,859,832) discloses methods and systems for the provision of remote printing services over a network.

Gassho et al. (US 2001/0022668) discloses a print job management system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satwant Singh

sks

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2626

KA Williams

KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER